

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 31, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14 to 16 and 18 to 23 are in the application, of which Claims 7, 8, 14, 15 and 20 to 23 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 7, 16 and 20 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's undersigned representative during the interview conducted on July 13, 2007. Applicant submits the following remarks accurately reflect the substance of the interview.

Turning to the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over by U.S. Patent No. 6,424,660 (Jacobson). Claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Jacobson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,281 (Seo). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In this regard, the applied references are not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 1 and 16, and in particular, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a management device receiving first and second data from a management center that manages a communication control device, and registering, in a memory, the first data for identifying the management device, and the second data for identifying the communication control device.

During the interview, the Office Action's characterization of Jacobson was discussed, particularly in light of the remarks set forth in the Amendment dated April 24, 2007 (the April Amendment). Specifically, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the

Office Action's assertion that Jacobson discloses "a target address (column 3, lines 18-22) that corresponds to the second identification data claimed and identifies the target component wireless interfaces that correspond to the communications control device claimed (column 5, lines 20-24, 31-36)". (Office Action, page 3; see also, the April Amendment, page 11). In particular, Jacobson is seen to disclose the contrary: "When a particular function is requested by a user, remote control device 220 transmits an IR signal 222 which identifies the request. This identification is typically a command code encoded into IR signal 222. IR signal 222 also includes a target address which identifies the intended target of the request. In the illustrated embodiment, reception device 200 is the target of the request rather than another component (such as a television or audio/video receiver)." (column 3, lines 13 to 22 of Jacobson)(emphasis added). Accordingly, while Jacobson's target address may identify reception device 200, Jacobson's target address is not seen to disclose or to suggest second data for identifying a communication control device, much less receiving the second data from a management center that manages the communication control device.

Additionally, in response to previous arguments in support of patentability, the Office Action points to Jacobson's disclosure that "individual components in individual rooms are coupled to transmit logic 306 via communication line 124 of FIG. 1. Each of the components is individually addressable, thereby allowing system controller 300 to identify particular ones of these components", and asserts that Jacobson's "system controller identifies components by individual addresses". (see Office Action, page 6, citing column 5, lines 20 to 24 of Jacobson). However, assuming *arguendo* that Jacobson's components have individual addresses, these component addresses are not seen to be the same as the

“target address” received by reception device 200, particularly in light of Jacobson’s express teaching that the target address identifies reception device 200 “rather than another component (such as a television or audio/video receiver).” (column 3, lines 21 to 22 of Jacobson). Accordingly, Jacobson’s disclosure of individually addressable components, without more, is not seen to disclose or to suggest receiving second data, for identifying a communication control device, from a management center that manages the communication control device.

During the interview, the Examiner was generally receptive to Applicant’s position and suggested filing a request for reconsideration to allow for more thorough consideration.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing and in view of the remarks set forth in the April Amendment, reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Applicant’s undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gregory S. Weaver, #53,751/

Gregory S. Weaver
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200